

1
2
3
4 SELINA KEENE, et al.,
5 Plaintiffs,

6 v.
7

8 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
9 FRANCISCO, et al.,
10 Defendants.
11

12 Case No. 22-cv-01587-JSW (RMI) (Lead
13 Case)
14 Case No. 22-cv-7645-JSW
15

16 **ORDER**
17

18 Re: Dkt. No. 105
19

20 Now pending before the court is an *ex parte* application for an order directing Defendant to
21 show cause why it should not be held in contempt based on what appears to be a run of the mill
22 disagreement between Plaintiff and Defendant regarding discovery (*see* dkts. 105, 106, 107, 108).
23 There is more than one problem with Plaintiff's application. First, this is not a suitable matter for
24 filing *ex parte*. *See* Civil L.R. 1-5(d) (defining the term as such: "*Ex parte* means contact with the
25 Court without the advance knowledge or contemporaneous participation of all other parties."); *see*
26 also Civil L.R. 7-10 ("Unless otherwise ordered by the assigned Judge, a party may file an *ex*
27 *parte* motion, that is, a motion filed without notice to opposing party, only if a statute, Federal
Rule, local rule, or Standing Order authorizes *ex parte* filing. The motion must include a citation
28 to the statute, rule, or order which permits the use of an *ex parte* motion to obtain the relief
sought.). This is not a suitable matter for contact with the Court without the advance knowledge or
contemporaneous participation of the other Party. Moreover, Plaintiff's motion is improperly filed
because it fails to include any citation to any authority that would permit use of an *ex parte* motion
to obtain the relief sought. Then there is the fact that requesting immediate contempt sanctions at
the outset of a discovery dispute, without first bringing the discovery dispute itself before the court

1 for adjudication, is also improper. Accordingly, Plaintiff's *ex parte* application (dkt. 105) is
2 **DENIED.**

3 If Plaintiff wishes to pursue adjudication of this discovery dispute, Plaintiff's counsel must
4 first meet and confer with opposing counsel in a good faith effort to resolve or narrow the dispute.
5 If after such good-faith efforts a discovery dispute continues to persist counsel may present that
6 dispute for adjudication by way of a jointly-filed letter brief in the manner and form that is set
7 forth in Paragraph 4 of the undersigned's General Standing Order.¹

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: August 7, 2023

10 
11 ROBERT M. ILLMAN
12 United States Magistrate Judge

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ¹ See <https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/judges/illman-rmi/RMI-Standing-Order-Revised9-16-22.pdf>.